

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/756,680

Applicant(s)

CAM ET AL.

Examiner

Blanche Wong

Art Unit

2419

Period for Reply
-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-8, 10 and 12-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 14 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-8, 10, 12, 13 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 March 2009 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/003)
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed March 10, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Amendment raises new 112 issues.

With regard to claim 6, Applicant states that "MAX_T is a measure of the number of cycles of the bus after which a training pattern or idle control words have been sent. It is configurable on start-up." Remark, p.5, lines 11-12. However, it is unclear from the claim language that MAX_T is such. Therefore, 112 rejection is maintained.

With regard to claim 15, Applicant states that "One bit time is the time required to transmit 1 bit given a particular clock rate." Remark, p.5, line 21. However, it is unclear from the claim language that one bit time is such. Even if Applicant is his/her own lexicographer, the term "bit time" is undefined in the Specification. Therefore, 112 rejection is maintained.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1 and 6 are objected to because of the following informalities:

With regard to claim 1, Examiner suggests replacing "transmitting ... between ... to ..." in lines 8-9 with "transmitting ... between ... and ..." or "transmitting ... from ... to ..." for proper grammar and clarity.

With regard to claim 6, Examiner suggests replacing "data and control signals" in line 2 with "data and control information" because Applicant states "the data and control signals in line 2 are the same as those in claim 1". Remark, p.5, line 10.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. **Claims 1,3-8,10,12,13,15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With regard to claim 1, it is unclear what the phrase "... and to align parallel data lines ..." in line 12 is modifying due to the run-on nature of the claim limitation.

With regard to claim 1, it is unclear what are the "signals" in line 13.

With regard to claim 1, it is unclear whether the "physical lines" in line 13 is the same as the physical paths also recited in claim 1.

With regard to claim 1, it is unclear what is meant by the phrase "send along physical lines starting at the same time arrive at the receiving end at the same time" in line 13.

With regard to claim 1, it is unclear what is "that" in "that comprise" in line 14 due to the run-on nature of the claim limitation.

With regard to claim 6, it is unclear what is "MAX_T" in line 3.

With regard to claim 15, it is unclear what is meant by "bit time" in line 28.

Claims 2-5,7,8,10,12,13 are rejected because they depend from rejected claim 1.

5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1, line 19, "packet destination".

Allowable Subject Matter

6. **Claim 14** is allowed.

7. Claims 1 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

8. Claims 2-8,10,12,13 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

With regard to claim 14, the prior art of record fails to anticipate or make obvious a de-skewing circuit, where M is an integer, comprising: "(a) M serial-in parallel-out blocks, each of said M SIPO blocks coupled to a corresponding one of said M data lines, said M SIPO blocks converting M-bit words of serial input data from said M data lines to parallel data, where M is an integer; (b) M register sets coupled to said M SIPO blocks, each of said M register sets storing most recent M-bit words of serial input data

arriving on each of said M data lines; (c) a training detector block coupled to said M register sets and detecting the presence of a training pattern based on the contents of said M register sets; (d) a plurality of transition detection blocks each coupled to one of said M register sets and searching and detecting a transition in each bit position within each one of said M register sets; and (e) an aligner block coupled to said plurality of transition detection blocks selecting appropriate bits within each of said M register sets from which to read each bit in order to present a de-skewed output."

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Blanche Wong whose telephone number is 571-272-3177. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 830am to 530pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Blanche Wong/
Examiner, Art Unit 2419
June 17, 2009

/Ayaz R. Sheikh/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419